

### **REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 18 May 2005. Responsive to that Office Action, Claim 1 is now amended to remove certain informalities noted by the Examiner therein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner specifically noted certain language in the Claims requiring clarification in order to be more clearly and fully understood. The Examiner indicated, however, that Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome this 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is amended to correct the instances of unclear wording noted by the Examiner. It is believed that these corrections now obviate the Examiner's formal concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is believed, therefore, that Claim 1 is now in allowable form.

MR929-1139  
Serial Number: 10/751,426  
Reply to Office Action dated 18 May 2005

It is respectfully submitted that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee  
Registration #40,262

Dated: 8/5/2005

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678